

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Published by the Council of Church Boards of Education in the United
States of America.

VOL. V.

MARCH, 1922

No. 6

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Personal Touch Thomas Arkle Clark.	3
Educational Advice and Direction of College Students . Stephen S. Colvin.	18
Church Work Among Women Students Agnes M. Hall.	35

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Published by the Council of Church Boards of Education in the United
States of America.

VOL. V.

MARCH, 1922

No. 6

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Personal Touch	3
Thomas Arkle Clark.	
Educational Advice and Direction of College Students .	18
Stephen S. Colvin.	
Church Work Among Women Students	35
Agnes M. Hall.	

THE PERSONAL TOUCH

THOMAS ARKLE CLARK*

Dean of Men, the University of Illinois

One of the main arguments advanced in favor of the small college as opposed to the big university is the fact that the small college offers so much more opportunity for personal contact between the individual undergraduate and the individual member of the faculty than does the larger institution. In a small college where the enrolment does not exceed a few hundreds it is quite within the range of possibility for the President or for the Dean, at least, to know everyone by his first name and to keep closely in touch with everyone. It is alleged that in a big university there is no possibility of any extensive personal contact between any specific university officer and the great mass of undergraduates.

Whether or not there is such personal relationship existing between faculty and students in the small college, is not for me to say. I am sure that such a relationship is very helpful and quite possible, but when I was an undergraduate in the University of Illinois the number of men registered was fewer than three hundred, and the President personally wrote out each man's study list at the opening of each term and signed it himself, yet I am sure that few if any of us felt that we had any personal touch with the President or thought that he had any specific interest in us as individuals, or knowledge of us. A great many undergraduate irregularities took place, student pranks and escapades were of almost daily occurrence, but no one was apprehended or disciplined because, for the most part I think, the President did not know his students well enough to locate the source of trouble. He would have been very much surprised to learn what we all knew very well, that one of the main sources of trouble was in his own household. So I say that though the personal touch is much more easily obtained in the small college than in the big university, I am not sure that one will always find it there. Nor am I convinced that a general personal relationship is impossible of attainment in the big university, for it is this result as Dean of Men that I have been attempting to attain in my own institution during the past twenty years.

*The Editor desires to call the favorable attention of the reader to Dean Clark's new book, *Discipline and the Derelict*, published by the Macmillan Co.

I think I need not argue long in favor of such a relationship in college. The boy away from home for the first time who feels that no one knows him, that no one wants to know him, and that no one cares, may sometimes be stimulated to greater initiative and stronger self-reliance by that feeling, but more often the result is a weakened loyalty, discouragement, and sometimes moral decline. It is not easy to say how many of us are kept at our tasks, unpleasant as they are at times, because someone knows and cares, because someone has an interest expressed or implied. How many of us are kept moral and clean for a similar reason? We do our work, many of us, to please our mothers or our wives or our friends or our boss; we walk straight in respect for what the neighbors or the Dean or our pastors would say or think, though, of course, some of us occasionally do right because it is right. It is a great deterrent, however, to any boy when he is having a struggle with himself either mentally or morally to realize that some one knows and sympathizes and that there is for him an open door which he may enter and present his troubles. There are strong arguments that appeal even to a Presbyterian in favor of the Confessional in some form or other.

"You never called me when I was in college," one of our graduates said to me a few years ago, "and I always wondered why. I often came to see you of my own accord, and though I told you little about my personal life, I was always sure that you knew. I should rather have resented your saying anything about my personal affairs, I think, but the fact that you knew and that I knew what you wanted me to do was a great help to me. It often kept me from evil; ultimately it changed my conduct. I don't know what would have happened had I been sure that no one knew."

Why did I not talk to him? I am not sure that I can answer excepting that I know that a man who is summoned to appear before any constituted official to answer for his sins always comes on the defensive; he means if possible to explain and to justify his conduct and one seldom gets anywhere with him. It is only when the man comes of his own volition and desire that one accomplishes much. Slater was never ready to talk to me, and I had a certain intuition that my best play was to

influence him indirectly. I suspect that for once, at least, I was right, for though he is married now and a thousand miles away, he always sends me a Christmas letter, and tells me what I did for him.

As I have said, there is no argument needed to prove the advantages of the personal touch in college. It is a source of encouragement, of inspiration, of moral and intellectual strength and of social control. These are facts that are being recognized in almost every reputable college in the country and college organization is being changed to bring about more easily this personal relationship between students and faculty. In most colleges it has been a good thing in theory to see that the undergraduate who was hungry or sick or in the city jail was looked after personally, but it was no one's especial business to do it, so it was not strange if sometimes the man who was sick had to look after himself and the fellow who was chucked into jail early in the evening lingered there without special attention from any member of the faculty until court opened the next morning.

As I see the matter, the job of those men who are doing religious work in the colleges for the various churches of the country is not dissimilar to my own. We are both trying to make moral and social conditions better, we are interested in the individual and what we can do for him, and we must all in time come to realize that about the most that we can do is to make his environment as satisfactory as possible, to quicken his conscience, to stiffen his back bone and to stimulate him to take responsibility, and to give him an opportunity to put before us his personal problems.

A religious worker said to me not long ago, "You have a great advantage over us. Whenever you want a man you can write him a note, and he has no alternative; he must come and see you whether he wants to or not."

I am not at all sure that this is an advantage, for, as I have said before, the man who is forced to come very seldom does so in the right spirit. Advice given unasked is like a great many other things we get for nothing, it is valued very cheaply.

"Did you want to see me?" the Dean asks of the young freshman who comes in awkwardly and stands before his desk.

"No; I didn't want to," was the reply, "but I had to."

The man who has to, encases himself in a sort of armor before coming in that is difficult if not impossible to penetrate. I think sometimes that because of the fact that I am a disciplinary officer my task is made more difficult than it otherwise would be, and that rather than having an advantage over the other man, he, on the contrary, has some advantage over me.

I think, also, that, in a general way, if we are to succeed that our methods must be somewhat the same, and if you don't mind, I am going to tell you a little in detail of what my methods have been, and of some things that I have learned.

The work of developing these personal relationships with students was a new work to me as it was to most people twenty years ago. No one so far as I know had ever given himself over to it. Personally, I had neither the intention nor the desire to do so. I was teaching English Composition with some success, and I had no desire to do anything else. The President at that time got all the "personal touch" in our institution that any one was supposed to get. If a student was in trouble he went to the President; if he should be gotten into trouble it was the President's business to do it. But the President was busy, and occasionally the undergraduate was too much for him, and he was forced to send out a call for help. It was on one of these distressing occasions that he sent for me, and by some lucky chance, I got him out of trouble and saved the boy. It was following this event that he conceived the, for him at least, happy idea of making me official trouble man. I balked for a year, but ultimately, seeing there was no other way to get rid of him, I consented.

I had no specific duties, no special authority, no precedents either to guide me or to handicap me. It was an untried sea upon which I was to set sail. My only chart was that, the action of the Board of Trustees said, I was to interest myself in the individual student. This meant, of course, that I was to know something, so far as it was possible for any one individual to do so, of the student's living conditions, his moral and social life, and his personal, individual problems. If I were to know these, I must first of all, I realized, be able to separate each individual from all the rest, and each undergraduate must

come to mean something personal and individual to me. He must be more than a part of a great group.

Whether previous to this time I had shown any particular ability thus to differentiate the individual, I cannot say. If I did have, no one had ever detected it or accused me of remembering people's names or faces or personal histories better than the ordinary. I had always liked my students, and had taken a friendly interest in them, but now I realized that if I were to do well the tasks assigned to me, I must know more about the men than I had hitherto known. And so I interested myself in where the various men lived, the conditions surrounding them in their lodging houses, their companions, where they spent their leisure hours, what sorts of homes they came from and what personal difficulties they were encountering.

I had some leisure, and I visited a good many men in their lodging houses as I made friends with them. If any one was ill, I called on him and wrote his parents, and saw that he was properly taken care of, that he had the right sort of doctor and decent nursing. I made it clear that any one might come to see me at any time, as he still may, in my office or at my home, and that I would discuss any topic that concerned him.

If I met a man on the street whose face was familiar and yet whose name had escaped me, I gave myself no peace until I had run down the name and captured it. I used every device possible to widen my acquaintance and in every natural way to come into personal contact with men. I attended every student gathering to which I was invited, I spoke to students whenever I had a chance, I went to parties every week, and I went out to dinner until my wife advised me to buy a meal ticket and have it punched whenever I took a meal and so save on board. I recall now that one worthy member of our faculty—I have no doubt that his record kept by the recording angel is much freer from blots than my own—took me to task rather seriously for attending gatherings of undergraduate men where smoking was permitted, because, as he said, my presence there gave sanction to the evil practice, and so was distinctly an immoral influence. Well, possibly he was right, but it certainly gave me a wonderful chance to meet men and talk to them when they were their natural selves, and I am afraid I have never been very penitent

over the dereliction. Whenever I went among the men, I kept my mind on the situation and made an effort to learn the names and affiliations of as many individuals as possible. Consciously I began to form associations which would help me easily to recall the names of the men whom I was regularly meeting.

Whenever we came together on the campus, I spoke to the men whom I had previously met, and called them by their names. It was a help in time to learn their first names and even the nicknames by which most men are familiarly known about the campus.

I had at times had a little hesitancy about calling a student by his first name even when I felt that I knew him well. Von Bergan came in to see me one day and after we had finished our conversation he turned to go.

"Come and see me again, Mr. Von Bergan," I said, in a friendly way.

"I wish you'd call me Von," he said, hesitating a little. "You call our other fellows by their first names, and it would seem more friendly if you'd do the same with me." And so from that time on, I called him "Von."

I found out very early that the one who is looking for information of any personal sort will never get it from the undergraduate by asking him questions. If you want to find out what an undergraduate thinks or knows, don't ask him anything directly; simply look pleasant and interested—not too interested—and let him talk, and if you have time enough to give to him he will tell you everything he has ever known or heard, and best of all he will be quite unconscious that he has done so, and give you credit later for being a wizard. If at any time, however, your curiosity gets the better of you and you begin to ask questions about any details which he may be presenting to you, he will at once grow suspicious and shut up as tight as a clam.

It was not long after I came into my office that I found I knew a good deal more about undergraduate conditions than I had ever before suspected. I soon came to understand how the town was being run or being allowed to run itself rather. I became familiar with gambling, and drinking and prostitution and realized how little the ordinary city government does

or seems to care to do to prevent or to control any of these things. I have seen a good many mayors, and I have known not a few chiefs of police, and I am forced to say that in general they are satisfied not to go too deeply under the surface of things, but to be content if the external appearance of affairs indicates that conditions are normal. The longer I live the more I am impressed with the indifference and the inefficiency of officials in our cities, and with the impossibility of getting much done through their cooperation. What I have been able to accomplish has been done for the most part through knowing and working with the individual student concerned and not largely through getting at the source of the evil even when it was quite clear what that source was.

I got rapidly acquainted with living conditions and where these were bad, I did what I could to change them. This changing of living conditions in a city of moderate size where the population is congested and where everyone wants to live within four blocks of the campus, is not as easy as it sounds. Young fellows would often rather live in an ill-kept, unsanitary house near the campus than move to a better and often a cheaper place a half mile farther away. But it has been possible even under these conditions through criticism and advice materially to improve living conditions. I could have done little, I am sure, had I not known personally the fellows concerned.

Until within the last few years nothing had been done either by the college or the two towns properly to take care of those who were ill, and especially of those who were ill of an infectious disease. The college had no provision for such care; the towns assumed no responsibility. If a student contracted small pox, for instance, as was happening constantly, the only possible disposition which could be made of him was to shut him up in a filthy, one-room sty without toilet facilities built by the city on a dump heap just outside of the city limits and let him find such attendance as was possible to pick up. This condition of affairs seemed all right when you didn't know the man concerned, but when the sick man was a fellow you were acquainted with, it was a condition not to be endured. When I had been through about three of these experiences, it was clear

to me that the university should have an isolation hospital to take care of infectious cases, and it now has one, pleasantly located, wonderfully comfortable and immaculately clean. The previous condition had existed because it had been no one's especial business to change it; no one had had the personal touch with the undergraduate who became seriously ill, who went through critical surgical operations, and who sometimes died without any college official seeing him or knowing much about him. For the past twenty years there has not been a surgical operation on any undergraduate man that I have not seen or known about. Every day I either go to the hospitals myself or send some one from my office who gets for me the information I want with reference to the people who are ill. No other one thing, I think, has brought me into closer and more sympathetic personal contact with students than this interest in the men who are sick. They seldom say much, but they do not forget nor do their parents.

There were a good many undergraduate customs which were foolish or vicious or detrimental to the good name of the institution, like hazing, for instance, which everyone deplored, but which it had been no one's business to correct. It was in fact difficult or impossible to correct them without knowing the source; and without being acquainted with the individual student it was impossible to know the source. It took time—ten years in fact—to eliminate some of these, but the elimination came gradually as one gradually learned who was likely to be at the bottom of things and got at him personally.

One of the most foolish customs extant when I became Dean of Men was the custom of the freshman and sophomore classes posting proclamations—vulgar exciting documents they were—all about the town. This was done shortly after college opened. The placards appeared in the most impossible places—on third story windows, on the roofs of houses, on public buildings or sidewalks, and telephone poles, and everywhere conceivable. There was always a clash of the two under classes and a row, with property destroyed and somebody hurt. It was not easy to locate the actual perpetrators of the deed, for they stole out of their houses after midnight or just before daylight when most decent people were in their beds, and "billed"

the town. I did know the student leaders, however, and these I called one day in autumn just before the time when an undergraduate outbreak might be expected.

"It's about time for the fall crop of proclamations to appear," I said to the President of the sophomore class. "The practice is hurting the University, and besides it has in it a considerable element of danger. It ought to be stopped."

"Yes, Dean," he replied politely. "Of course you know I don't have anything directly to do with it."

"Possibly not," I replied, "but you know or can easily find out who has to do with it. You are the President of the class, and the thing won't happen without your consent. I wish you would call it off, for if the proclamations are posted this fall, I shall have to hold you and the other class officers personally responsible." There was no trouble that fall, and there has not been since. It was the personal touch again that won.

To get into touch with any group of young fellows, one must have sympathy for them, he must understand their problems and their temptations, he must have real interest in them, he must have a young heart at least even if he has an old head. He must remember, also, that the hearts of young people are pretty much the same as they always were even if customs are changing and the habits of young people seem to him very different from what they were when he was himself young. We are shocked sometimes at what seems to us the frivolity and the utter frankness of the young person of today upon what were to us a generation ago rather delicate and private topics. The amount of dancing indulged in at the present time, for example, is positively shocking we often feel. In the country neighborhood in which I lived before I went to college, no young person who wished to lay claim to respectability either danced or played cards. We often tell our young people so now, and with no little virtuous pride. We did other things quite as foolish and quite as reprehensible, however, because the conventions of our community interposed no objections to them. We must remember all these things if we are to get on well today. Infinite patience unwavering faith, and at least an average knowledge of human nature are essential.

We read a good deal about fraternities these days and

opinions are expressed pretty freely, especially by those who know least about the matter, as to the evil influences of these organizations. As for myself, I believe in the Greek letter fraternity in college and can say that its influence at the University of Illinois has been a good influence. We have sixty or more, national and local, and I am personally acquainted with most of the men in each one, and know pretty intimately how the fellows live and what their habits are. During the year I usually manage to eat at least one meal in almost every fraternity house about the campus and frequently I visit the houses more than once. I try to get acquainted with every fellow in each of the houses I visit and to make each of the members know me a little better. If it were not for this custom which these organizations follow of inviting me to their houses, I should have a much more difficult task than I now have of knowing each particular fraternity man.

The reason that the moral and intellectual irregularities of fraternity men are stressed so strongly, often unjustly, I am sure, is that a man in an organization is not allowed to suffer for his own errors. Every man in the organization suffers and what the one man did the organization must pay. If a fraternity man drinks, or gambles or fails in his college work, the blame is not placed upon him individually but upon his fraternity in particular and upon all fraternities in general. The facts are that the principles upon which fraternities are founded are high principles; most of them as I know them are drawn directly from the teachings of Jesus Christ, and, if followed, would recreate every young fellow's life. The same is true of the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church of which I am an unworthy member, but I should be the last to blame upon the weaknesses of the Church all the irregularities of its members.

It has been thought by a good many religious workers that the fraternities which draw their membership from the ranks of a certain church are for this reason the safest. I have not found it so, nor have they been the ones longest to endure. The choice of men was sometimes limited, the type of man from which a selection could be made was more uneven, and his social qualities not always so pleasing. Ultimately every fraternity I

have known composed of men exclusively from one church has either broken down, or broken away from its church affiliation and become national. There is to me nothing discouraging in this.

I have said so much about fraternities because it is through fraternities and organizations in general that I have been able, as the numbers increased beyond anyone's expectations, to keep in touch with the individual quite as well as was possible when the number of students was less than half as great, and I believe it is the way you in your religious work will do this. The religious worker has found the fraternity difficult; he has not gotten in as he should have done, he has not forced the close personal relationship with fraternity men which has made him a regular and a welcome guest at fraternity houses. In failing to do this he has missed a great opportunity. He has failed often to win over to his side the leaders of the campus, and he has not had behind him the tremendous power of campus organizations.

I am not always in good favor with every campus organization. Often my decisions are very annoying to some of them, and not infrequently their request must be refused. Then, for a time, they will have none of me, and my very name is an anathema.

"I don't like your methods or your system," a fraternity man said to me not long ago.

"All right," I said, "that's your privilege, and I'm only human, anyway. I'll make an agreement with you, however, if you wish," I continued. "If neither you nor any member of your fraternity will come to me for the rest of the year for help or advice or request for privilege, I will agree not to interfere with your fraternity or to call any member of it during that time." He thought the proposition over for a while and then shook his head.

"I don't believe that would be a good trade," he said. He was right; if you make yourself useful or necessary to people, they will bear a good deal from you.

Most of us find it easy to preach to a crowd, but it is contact with the individual that ultimately counts most. Throughout the years that I have been a University officer I have spoken

regularly every week to groups of men at one place or another. Sometimes, perhaps, such talk carries home; but the most effective work that I do is where the man and I are face to face across the desk from each other or sitting side by side, each with a chance to tell what is in his mind and heart.

In an article in the last number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, Charles M. Sheldon in discussing this same subject says:

"The average church committee, seeking a man for a church, wants a man who can draw a crowd. The church is looked upon as a place to go to, to hear some one.

"But people want something more than preaching. They want comfort and courage and help that does not come to them when it is handed out wholesale. A whole Sunday afternoon given every week to the Open Door, established as a church custom, might in multitudes of churches prove to be worth more than all the pulpit ministrations and all the machinery of multiplied organizations.

"I wonder as the years flow down the channel of Time, why I have put so much emphasis on the Pulpit, and so little on the people in my Parish. God forgive me if I have thought more of my sermons than I have thought of my souls!"

And his experience has been mine. Whatever influence, intellectual or social or moral, that I may have exercised during the years that I have worked with students has come not through contact with the crowd, though I have had that constantly and regularly, but through sympathetic personal touch with the individual. For years I have been in my office pretty regularly six days in the week for at least eight hours a day. Anyone is free to come and see me there, or, if he prefers it, at my house after dinner or on Sundays. And they do come by the hundreds. They bring the petty inconsequential things that can be decided or settled in a few moments, and they bring the things the settlement of which may make or wreck a life. There is no monotony and no two days are alike. There are the stories with which you are all familiar—the struggles with poverty and temptation and sin, and discouragement where faith must be strengthened and courage awakened and self-reliance developed, and opportunity discovered; there are the stories of love and

disappointment, and each one of these problems is to the man who brings it real and vital.

"I don't suppose you've ever had any case just like mine," the man begins, and he is right in a way, for no two cases are ever quite alike.

My paper is perhaps already long enough, but I cannot bring it to a close without giving you two or three illustrations of just what this personal relationship with undergraduates does bring to one.

The telephone rang one Sunday afternoon just as I was settling down for a little rest after a long hard week. It was Doctor Bennett's voice that spoke when I took down the receiver.

"Could you run over to Romaine Street and see Ferguson this evening? He has a good deal on his mind, and he would like to talk to you."

I had known Ferguson since his freshman year, and he was now a junior. His father was a hard working minister in a little country town in Illinois, and the boy had been forced largely to look after his own support. He was a good boy at heart, but easily influenced.

He was lying in bed when I entered his room, and I could see that he was laboring under an intense excitement.

"Tell me about it," I said sitting down beside him and taking his hand. It was a halting story he told me, but a story as old as the race. He had been tempted, he had yielded, and he had contracted a dangerous disease that it would take years wholly to eradicate.

"I can't be taken care of here," he said, "and I can't afford to go to a hospital. I'm afraid to tell father, for he wouldn't understand, and he'd throw me out. I started to kill myself this afternoon, but I'm afraid to do that." And then he burst into tears.

We talked it over for a long time; we considered first one plan of procedure and then another only to reject them all. There was really only one way out and that was to tell his father, and I finally won his consent to let me do this, though he was sure it would be useless.

I waited until after the time of the evening service before

I called up the boy's father; I had never before realized what a cold inhuman means of communication the long distance telephone is until I tried that evening to talk sympathetically over it. But my message and my explanation got through and the father was a game one. He met the situation without faltering and traveled all night and was waiting for me when I got to my office next morning. He had a good heart, but he was a poor hand at subterfuge. His chief concern was how he could explain to the neighbors without giving the real facts away, but he and I, two perfectly respectable Presbyterians, worked out an explanation that was both truthful and effective. Father and son were never before so near together as they were when they went home next day to find mother waiting for them at the station. The story ends happily, for the boy got well and came back to college and graduated and is now a successful and respected practicing physician.

Carter entered my office a few weeks ago rather bashfully.

"I want to ask you some questions," he said, "and I hope you won't laugh at me." I promised him that I should be as serious as I was capable of.

"I'm going to a formal party," he continued. "And I've never been to one before. The young lady has been to ever so many and knows everything about what is conventional, and I don't want to seem a rube to her, so I thought I'd ask you how to act and what to wear."

It was a serious matter, I could see, so I did not smile.

"I could have asked the fellows at the house," he explained, "for a lot of them know, but they would have kidded me and given me a lot of bunk so they could laugh at me later, and I was sure you would tell me the truth."

I would not have played him false for a king's ransom. I brought out my store of sartorial knowledge and we discussed at length, white vests and black ones, long tails and tuxedos, pumps, kid gloves, bow ties, and how to get in and out of a room without damaging the furniture. We got quite chummy before we were through, and I loaned him a fancy vest to make his outfit complete. On the evening of the party he walked six blocks to show me the shirt he was going to wear, for at the last moment he had sinking of heart because he was in doubt as to

whether he ought to choose a stiff bosom or a soft front. I looked him over and passed him on as perfect and was assured later that he didn't make a slip and that a good time was had by all.

About Thanksgiving time last year, Jim Easton, a big, husky freshman was waiting for me when I got back after luncheon.

"Well, Jim?" I asked when we were seated across from each other.

"Did you ever run away, Dean, when you were a Kid?" Jim interrogated.

"No, I never did, Jim," I answered. "But I planned to do it more than once, and I wanted to like the dickens, though something always happened to prevent it."

"Well, I can't stand it much longer," he went on, "and unless some one locks me up or ties me to a telephone pole, I'm going to pull out of this. I know I'm a fool, but that doesn't help any."

We didn't reason it out; it was no use. We just talked it over. Jim didn't realize that his having told me how he felt would be very likely to prevent him from yielding to his feelings. I exacted from him a promise that before he ran away he would come in and tell me, and I agreed that in such a case I should do nothing to prevent him. He is still sticking to his job.

Anyone who works with a constantly changing group of young people must often lose heart, and grow discouraged, and ask himself if he is really getting anywhere. Would I take up the work again if I were back at the crossroads where I stood twenty years ago and were given a chance to choose? I wonder!

I had a call from Hunter two years ago. Hunter had been graduated ten years and had been in all parts of the world in his practice of engineering. He was a rough ill-trained undergraduate with a good many questionable habits, and we had had not a few interviews before he got out of college. If I had ever made any impression on Hunter, he gave no indication of it. If I had done him any good, it was not evident.

"I have often intended to write you," he said, "but I'm careless about writing, and I never got round to it. You

thought that you made no impression on me while I was in college, and I meant you to think so, but it wasn't true. I simply wanted to give the impression that I was "hard boiled." I've been up against all sorts of temptations, but I've really kept clean. If you ever have a tendency to get discouraged and to think that we aren't influenced by what you say, don't yield to it. It is all worth while and the fellows don't forget."

And this last story I tell you for your encouragement.

EDUCATIONAL ADVICE AND DIRECTION OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

STEPHEN S. COLVIN

Director, School of Education, Brown University

I suppose there are a vast number of pressing needs in education. There always are, but one that has appealed to me very, very strongly in the last few years is the need of a more intimate knowledge and a more direct guidance of the great mass of students in our high schools and in universities.

There are many reasons, I suppose, why we are out of touch in our educational system with our pupils and students. I want to enumerate a few of these reasons as I see them. The first, it seems to me is due to a totally wrong theory in education, and that theory is that the business of education is very largely to test what the student has learned. The principal thing to be done is to find out how much he knows. That, of course, has led the high school and the elementary school and to a certain extent our colleges to practice what is known as lesson-hearing. We know very little about how the pupil or the student prepares his work, about the conditions that surround him in general; we simply know what he does in the class-room. Lesson-hearing is one of the great curses of education in the elementary school and the high school. When we come to college work we find another sort of practice, which is very largely predominant, that is just as vicious. This is the lecture system, with its occasional tests. I know from personal experience, talking with students, that when they come to college and take the large lecture courses, they are frequently totally at loss as to what they shall do. They do not know how to go about their work

or what results are expected. Nowhere in our whole educational system, except possibly in the kindergarten and the graduate courses of the universities, do students and pupils have anything like adequate supervision in the directing of their work and in the directing of their other activities. In the kindergarten and in the primary grades, of course, the teacher knows a good deal about the children. As we go on into the upper grades of the elementary school, the teacher knows less and less, except in so far as the teacher meets the children in the classroom. The teacher in the high school knows even less, and the instructor in the university knows practically nothing at all about his students except in so far as they appear in his classes, recite occasionally, pass certain tests, and so on and so forth. Such conditions as these have tended to separate us from and isolate us from our pupils and our students.

If we could take another attitude, an attitude that is very much better as far as actual education is concerned, namely that we are to work with our students and that one of our chief functions is to help them to study and to direct their activities, we would know a great deal more about them. This lack of what we are later to learn about as "The Personal Touch," this lack of intimate knowledge, is in part due to the wrong way in which we are actually working with the student body.

Another reason why we are out of personal touch with our student body is the upset that all of our higher institutions of learning experienced during the War and the difficulty of getting readjusted to our problems.

A third reason which just at present is very important is found in the tremendous number of students that are coming to our high schools, our colleges and universities. I am unaware of any institution of higher learning that is not reporting a larger freshman class this year than last year,—and last year the classes were large. This is true of all kinds of institutions of learning. Our state universities are overwhelmed with students. Over 3,000 students in the entering classes of many of our larger state universities, means a considerable increase over past numbers. Dartmouth, a private institution, expects to have 5,000 applicants for admission to its freshman class next year, and it can accommodate only 500 first-year men. Brown

University, a somewhat smaller institution, has nearly 500 in its freshman class this year and it has reached the limit of its capacities.

When we get such a large mass of students in classes that are overcrowded, there is very little opportunity for the instructor really to know anything about these students, to know anything about them in any way that will be helpful to them. All the instructor can do is to lecture, to quiz and to give occasional tests. Outside of the work of the administrative offices there is absolutely no knowledge of and no real contact with the student body.

It is quite obvious to all of us that these young men and young women cannot be turned adrift in the early days of their college life without more or less serious consequences resulting. Many of these students for the first time in their lives are away from home and they need guidance more than ever before. There is no theory that I know of that says that a boy or girl at the age of eighteen or nineteen, on entering college, can get along without aid, advice and direction, except, of course, the occasional direction that he can get through the Dean's office or through the advice of other students.

This is an overwhelming fact that we have all got to face. The work in many of our colleges is breaking down in the classrooms because we cannot give adequate instruction and supervision. It is breaking down in many other ways because of the masses of students that are coming, about whom we know very little and whom we cannot in any adequate way help or direct or advise.

What are some of the remedies for this situation? One remedy, of course, is quite apparent; it is this: let us cut down the number of students that enter our higher institutions of learning. Let us set a definite limit. Let us take in no more than we can adequately look out for. From the standpoint of the institution this plan has a good deal to recommend it; from the standpoint of the young men and women who want an education and who need an education, it has very, very little to recommend it and much that is against it.

I take it that every boy or girl who has any intellectual ability at all to go beyond the high school in this country of

ours should have a higher education if he or she aspires to it, and to say that we will rigorously limit the student body so that a large number must be deprived of a higher education is a rather serious thing for the individual concerned and also a very serious thing for us as a nation, because of the fact that we need all the educated men and women we can possibly get in order that we may go on, thrive, and develop our democratic ideals. So it is a rather dangerous expedient from the standpoint of the interests of the Nation as a whole to attempt to limit the student body so that a large number of young men and young women are shut out of getting a kind of education that we believe would be beneficial to them.

On the other hand, it is equally certain that there are types of higher education that many of the boys and girls who graduate from our high schools are not fitted to follow and cannot follow with profit. It is no kindness to them to allow them to enter institutions and then to fail. There are certain kinds of education I believe that are unsuited to the abilities of certain students. It is our duty to prevent students from entering those types of education for which they are not fitted. I cannot conceive it at all desirable, either for the institution or for the student or for the Nation as a whole, that young men or young women should attempt courses in our colleges and universities for which they are not adapted or which they cannot master.

The solution of the problem from another point of view is not the limitation of the student body. It is a readjustment of the courses in the higher institutions of learning to meet needs that are not adequately met at the present time. But taking it from the point of view of established courses of study, it is very clear that it is a highly desirable thing to allow no student to enter upon that course of study in which he has not a reasonable chance of making good.

Assuming that this is true, and assuming that there are certain kinds of institutions, smaller endowed institutions for example, that cannot offer certain types of study and cannot with their present resources remodel what they already have to meet new and different needs, how are we going to prevent an influx of undesirable students into such courses? There are

various ways that have been tried, none of which is entirely satisfactory.

College entrance has been determined, to a very large extent in the past in the East, by entrance examinations, and many institutions in the East still maintain their entrance examinations (either given by themselves or by the College Board) without very much change. These older types of entrance examinations have been shown conclusively to be inadequate to determine the fitness of a boy or girl to pursue a course in college. There is no doubt whatever but what they are inadequate. They are better than nothing at all. They do determine to a certain extent whether a boy or girl is likely to succeed in college, but they do not determine success or failure to a sufficient degree to be anywhere near a satisfactory guide.

More recently a newer type of examination has been worked out and is now being used in many institutions that require examinations for entrance, called the comprehensive examination. This examination does seem to be somewhat superior to the older type of examination in determining fitness for college. But this again is clearly inadequate as a single means of determining fitness for college work.

Then, of course, we have other means. We have in the East the plan of certifying superior pupils in the high school to college, the certifying privilege being granted to certain preparatory schools in terms of the product that they have already turned out. Here in the Middle West we find a somewhat different scheme based on the certifying of the high school. All of these schemes have some value, but none of them is by any means perfect.

Now comes the psychological test, the attempt to determine the scholastic ability of a young man or a young woman by giving a mental test that shall measure what is termed by the psychologists "general intelligence." This attempt, like these others, is by no means a perfect success. I have been working with intelligence tests for the past four years. I have read the literature on intelligence tests as it relates to colleges and universities. I have tried to read every bit of it since it first appeared and I feel convinced that intelligence tests are a valuable means of determining success or failure, but not very much more

valuable than some of these other means that we have suggested.

Summing the whole matter up very briefly, I am of the opinion that there is no means which we have to-day that will determine with more than a fair degree of probability the future career of a boy or girl in college. So when we try to exclude certain individuals on the basis of entrance examinations or certification from preparatory school or by examination of the preparatory school or by psychological tests, we are admitting a good many who ought not to enter because they cannot do the work, and we are excluding a good many who could do the work if they were allowed to enter. Yet if we must limit the student body we must employ these means because they are the best that we have. We cannot admit everybody.

A more important measure, it seems to me, is for us to readjust our college courses and our university courses, particularly in the freshman year, and to provide various types of studies so that practically every boy and girl who graduates with a decent record from a good high school can get something that is worth while out of our higher institutions of learning. That is a problem that we must work out in the next few years if we are to succeed in developing the higher education of young manhood and young womanhood as we ought to in the United States.

What are we going to do to provide all of these boys and girls who want a college education with the work they need? If we are to admit all, what new types of education are we to give them in order that they shall profit—all of them—by the courses that they take? These are pressing questions, demanding immediate answers. Then, after we have admitted these students to college comes the great problem in which I am particularly interested—the problem of helping them to get the most out of their college work that they possibly can get, the problem of directing their interests and energies in such a way that they will be led from their college course into something else beyond it that is suited to their needs and their abilities. This is where the problem of educational guidance and direction, and incidentally the problem of vocational guidance, comes in. This is the thing that, as far as I know, is almost absolutely and entirely ignored in our higher institutions of learning.

We have a duty, it seems to me, when we have admitted these young men and women, to see that they do get on, that they do get something out of a higher education. A great many university instructors take the attitude that they have no duty at all, that all they have to do is to make the course as stiff as they can and just as foreign as they can to the interests of those that are taking it and then let the fittest survive. Such instructors glory in the fact that their course eliminates so many during the first year. They look down upon some other courses in which elimination is not so drastic. They seem to think that those courses in which a large number of the students survive and out of which a substantial number get a certain amount of real interest are somehow unworthy. They glory in the fact that they fail from one-half to one-third of their students. They believe that if it were not for English, or if it were not for mathematics, or whatever subject it is in the particular institution which is hard and exacting that there would be many who would go through college that ought to be dismissed. They feel it is because they are so rigorous and so searching that they eliminate and put out of existence those unworthy young people that are in our colleges. These instructors never think that possibly they themselves are at fault; they never think that possibly they have done a large amount of harm to these young people who have come to the institution and have tried to do something, but who have failed and who have gone out of the college disgraced.

So it seems to me we must try to adjust our courses to the capacities of our students. We are not going to lower our standards entirely; we are going to have adequate rigor and a reasonable standard of proficiency, but we are going to try to do all that we can, in terms of the standards that we believe are desirable, to help these young men and women to succeed rather than to try, as it sometimes seems to me, positively to make them fail—to glory in the fact that we have made them fail. Such an attitude seems to me to be almost unethical.

If we believe in giving genuine help to our students, how are we going to do this? Are there any things that we can do right from the start to secure success where failure might come

if we did not help out? Or can we do anything to make success greater than it otherwise would be?

I have been working on this problem, and I am far from certain that I can say anything that is very definite, because it is a tremendously big problem and it is in its experimental stages as far as I am concerned. However, I want to tell you what has been done at Brown University. I want to explain some of the things that we have done that seem to me to be worth while and some of the things that we ought to do to make our work more worth while.

In the first place, perhaps it is well for me to recount exactly what we do at Brown University in attempting to guide and help students so that they will make a greater success of their work than if they were left entirely to their own resources. The first thing we do on the first day of the college year is to give every boy a very comprehensive and thorough psychological examination. This is the hardest examination that he has ever taken and probably ever will take, at least in college. It occupies three solid hours of the most strenuous and exacting work. To succeed well in it his mind must be keenly active all the time.

This psychological examination is followed a few weeks later by another one not quite as long, not quite as exacting. The reason for giving two examinations is this,—that unless there is a very close accord between these two examinations we feel there is probably something wrong in the way in which the student has taken the examination, and so one examination is given as a check on the other. It is seldom that these two examinations conflict to any very great extent. Most students who stand high in one examination stand high in the other, and most students who stand low in one examination stand low in the other. I do not know whether you are familiar with the correlation terminology, but I will say simply that between these two sets of examinations there is a correlation co-efficient that ranges .8 to .9, a perfect correlation being 1.00. That is a very high correlation, so it shows that these psychological tests do reveal fairly well what the psychologists call native intelligence, native intelligence meaning the real inborn capacity of the person to learn, especially to learn about things that have to

do with words and abstractions. There seem to be at least three varieties of native intelligence. One kind of native intelligence is what we call abstract intelligence, which has to do with book learning and all the various intellectual activities that we are acquainted with in schools and colleges. Another kind of intelligence has to do with ingenuity with the hands and insight into acts of skill. A third type of inborn intelligence, which we may call social intelligence, has to do with the way an individual gets on with his fellows. For instance, it would be very highly desirable for a person who was preparing to be a minister of the gospel to have a high type of abstract intelligence; it would be equally important for him to have a high type of social intelligence in order for him to do the kind of things that he has to do with his parishioners. It might be worth while for him to have a modicum of mechanical intelligence.

All we are concerned with in colleges, at the outset at least, is this ability that we call abstract intelligence, and we are quite sure that this has a very definite relation to the kind of work that one has to do in an ordinary academic course.

These psychological tests, then, do reveal to a very large extent, I am convinced, the real native intelligence of the individual, and we find that the intelligence of college men and women does vary considerably; that not all students by any means are exactly the same in learning capacity. Of course as the intelligence varies in high school, and not nearly so much as it does in the elementary school, because the further you go up the educational ladder the narrower the range of abilities that you get. In the elementary school you find nearly all grades of intelligence except the feeble-minded. You get those that are dull and stupid and you occasionally get a genius. In the high school you cut off a few of the duller and more stupid ones, and you find relatively a few more bright ones. When you reach college you have cut off a very large number of the very dull and very stupid, and you get only those of a fairly high degree of intelligence plus those of a very high degree of intelligence. Yet even here you will find a considerable variety, and it is quite clear that some of the young men and young women who enter college are not nearly so capable in their original endowment for doing college work as are some others;

some perhaps can do the work two or three times as easily as others.

The next thing that we do at Brown University is to find out as much as we can about the student by having him make out what we call a personnel card. We call this Personnel Card No. 1. This card is made out by the student not alone, but with some officer present so that when he makes it out we see that he does it without consulting others. We ask him a good many things. I will not attempt to go into all the things that we do ask. We require him to tell us in the first place, why he has come to college, what his idea is of a college education. Does he come to college to get what is called a general education, or does he come to get special training in some particular field? Does he come because his parents wish him to? Because of the social privileges and advantages? Because of the athletic sports? Because he is preparing himself for some profession or business? We try to find out what his purpose is in coming to college. Of course we don't find out very much; he doesn't know.

We have every freshman write an essay as a part of his work on, "Why I came to college," and those are always interesting, showing that a very large number have no definite idea at all.

Then we try to find out something about his high school interests. We ask him what subjects he did the best in and what subjects he did the worst in, in high school. We ask him to check off the subjects that he liked the best and those that he liked the least. We also ask him in what subjects he had the best teachers and the poorest teachers. We try to find out what sports and games he is interested in. We try to find out something about his reading interests, what kind of reading he likes the best—history, newspapers, magazines, biography, travel, science, poetry, novels, etc. Then we ask him to name five books or continued stories that he read during the previous year. That is one of the hardest things we ask. Not all by any means can name five that they have read. Then we ask the number of hours that he generally reads for pleasure.

We ask him to estimate himself according to twenty-five qualities, such as studiousness, and so on.

We ask if he is in whole or in part supporting himself, if he is acquainted with any business, trade or profession, has any mechanical skill, cares for music, works of art, painting, sculpture, theatres, can he sing, play, draw or paint? Has he ever written stories? Have they been published? And various other things of that sort.

Later on in the year (and this is the most important part of the whole matter), each student is brought before an advisor. For the students at Brown we have a committee of thirteen. I fear that is an unlucky number. It seems to be in some instances, because so few men stay on this committee more than one year. Each student has to appear before his advisor, and his advisor talks with him for a certain length of time and tries to find out definite facts in regard to him, either directly or indirectly. Among the things that the advisor tries to find out is something about the student's parents, how many children there are in the family, what his father's occupation is, what the economic status of the family is, what the schooling of his brothers and sisters has been, as well as their occupations. It is very interesting to learn that you can tell almost as much about the probability of the student's success by finding out what his brothers and sisters have done in school as you can by any other means. That is, if you find in a family where there are three or four children that all of these children have graduated from the elementary school two or three years under age, you will be very sure that here you have a student who has more than ordinary intelligence. I do not know of a case of this sort where the brothers and sisters seem to have been a little brighter, a little more capable than the ordinary rank and file in the elementary school and in the high school, that has not also shown the student himself to have mental ability above the average.

We ask also when the student graduated from the elementary school and high school. Then we ask a good deal about his study habits. We try to find out where he studies and when he studies, whether he has any regularity about his study or not, and about how much he studies and whether he studies with efficiency or not.

I have found out some surprising things in my own per-

sonal interviews with students, and one of the most striking is this: that apparently the large majority of students do not study more than ten of twelve hours a week, and some of the brightest students study only about five hours a week. Brown University is not a particularly easy institution; the courses are not snap courses altogether, but I have found, if the students tell the truth, that some who are making very good records do not study more than an hour a day. Then I find, on the other hand, some that are working four or five hours a day. There is the greatest variety, but the average is only about two hours a day.

The student is asked about his extra-curricula activities, what he is doing outside of his ordinary scholastic work, in the musical clubs, the literary work, the athletic work, and so on. Then he is asked if he has any work that he is required to do in order to earn his living. There you find a tremendous variation. You find a good many that are doing nothing at all; you find some that are working a couple of hours a day, and in some instances I have found students who are working eight hours a day in order to earn their way through college.

We try to find out about the student's health; we try to get an estimate of his personality, his intelligence, his attitude toward college work, and so on.

On the other side of this card we keep a careful record of everything that pertains to the student's work, the grades he receives, his intelligence scores, whether he has obtained honors in college or not, whether he has done poor work and we get a reasonably complete record.

We also get from the principal of the high school a fairly careful estimate of the student. We try to find out his rank in the graduating class, the subject that he did his best work in, and the subject he did his poorest work in. We try to find out whether he was a member of any school organization and whether he had any pronounced interests, whether he was a leader in worth-while activities, and what are his personal qualities.

In addition to this we offer to the freshman a series of so-called orientation lectures. In these lectures we try to get him acquainted with the interesting and important things in college

We have lectures on hygiene, on how to study, on certain matters in regard to the routine of college work, and so on.

We are attempting at present to put into the library a collection of books, accessible to all the men and women, headed, "After College What?" We find that these books are being widely read. We are now trying to put into the library set of books, "In College What?" We are planning later on to have a set of lectures by the most prominent alumni of Brown, and of other institutions as well, and further by men who have not graduated from college, in regard to certain important life careers.

In these ways, then, we are trying to get in touch with the students and to know them, but the important thing, the great thing, is not the psychological tests, it is not the cards that these men make out, it is not the reports that we get from the high schools, it is not any of these things that have to do with their records, although they are important. It is the personal interview, and unless you get rather extensive personal interviews with these young men and get them in such a way that they are not formal but reach the heart of the matter, the rest is merely machinery. These other things in and of themselves have no great use, in my opinion, unless you have the personal interview. In order to do that you need to spend a great deal of time. It cannot be a five-minute or a ten-minute interview; it cannot be just one interview; it must be followed up by other interviews. It cannot be something that is mechanical; it has to be something that has insight into it, and understanding and comprehension. That is the thing that costs the most in time and energy and in actual money, yet that is the thing that must be done if we are to succeed at all in getting a real insight into the men that we are working with.

I have outlined roughly some of the things that we are trying to do. I would like to call to your attention briefly, in closing, some of the facts that have come to my attention through interviews and through psychological tests and through all of these other means, facts that show why men fail or succeed in college.

In making this analysis I investigated particularly striking cases where there was some reason to believe that we did not

understand clearly from the records and the interviews why this young man was not doing well in college, or, on the other hand, why another was succeeding.

The first reason, is, of course, that there are certain persons who enter college who have not sufficient intelligence to do the kind of work that is demanded of them. That is quite obvious; they fail; they cannot succeed unless you give them a different type of work. They can be dismissed with that one statement: they haven't enough innate intelligence to get on with the kind of work that is offered in the way in which it is offered. That does not mean that they could not get on if the work were offered in a somewhat different way, but taking the course as it is they fail because they haven't enough real innate ability to succeed.

There are a good many other reasons. Let me mention a few. One of the most important reasons, more important than a lack of intelligence, in my opinion, for failure in college as well as in life, is a serious character defect. I mean by a character defect something rather general. I don't mean character in any one simple way, but I mean by this what may be called determination, persistence, will-to-do, willingness to stand up and to strive for something that you feel is worth while. That, at least, is one very large expression of character, and possibly on the whole it might sum up almost anything that comes under the name of character.

There are a good many men who have intelligence in the abstract sense who haven't any determination, who will not work, and that is one of the largest causes for failure, as far as I have been able to determine.

Closely connected with a lack of character in this sense of the word are certain temperamental defects. I know of a number of students who are not doing good work because they go up and down; sometimes they will work and sometimes they don't feel like working and won't work. They are sometimes elated, sometimes depressed. Of course you do find actual cases of morbidity and insanity in any large body of college students. I am not speaking of that particularly, but I am speaking of a temperament that is rather unstable and uncertain, a lack of emotional balance.

There are many who fail because of outside demands. Some of these outside demands are obligations that students take on themselves—social demands and demands in connection with the extra-curricula activity. There are others that they do not willingly assume but have to undertake. There are men, as I have already said, who are working many hours a day, who have no recreation whatsoever and who simply grind all the time. When they try to work they are so fatigued and at such a low ebb intellectually that they can't do anything.

There are many who have very poor habits of study who spend a great deal more time on study than would be necessary if they had the right habit,—who study at the wrong time, who have no consistent way of studying, who have no real common sense about it. There are some who fail because of a poor preparation, but these are not very numerous.

Quite a number fail or do poor work because of wrong ideals in regard to college life, who feel that it is not the right thing for them really to do very well in their work, who feel that all they need to do and all they should do is to just get by. They assume if they do more than that there is something wrong.

I want to read you one or two actual examples to show you what I mean:

Failure due to lack of study. Student G, class of 1923. Graduated from high school at 17; doing satisfactory work; received high scores in intelligence test. College grades far below average. His poor record is explained by lack of adaptation and application. Studies not more than an hour a day during the semester, but crams for examination. Dropped at the end of third semester because of poor work. Low grades due to outside distraction.

Student R, class of 1922. Graduated from high school at 16. Brother senior in high school at 16; sister junior at 15. Father general manager of a grain company. Brown and army tests indicate that the student is considerably above the average in intelligence. Pays his way through college working eight hours a day. Distracted and tired when he tries to study. Work of the first two semesters below average. Last semester complete failure.

Low attainment due to wrong ideals. Student G, class of 1922. Family of high mental capacity. Father college professor of ability and distinction. High scores in psychological tests. Says he could do much better work if he cared to but does not think it worth while.

Low attainment due to character defect. Student W, class of 1923. Graduated from high school slightly below middle of class. Brown test and Thorndike test scores excellent. Work has been below average for last two semesters and is growing steadily poorer. Spends much time reading romances. Weak and without determination. Studies very little.

I have collected quite a large number of these cases. One type of case that interested me very much was this: I found a good many men who are making good records in college but who are not doing work anywhere up to their capacity. They seem to think it is entirely right if they get fairly high grades to let it go at that. They never consider college an opportunity. They are surprised when told that they ought to do something beyond what is merely demanded of them.

Let me indicate in conclusion just a few facts that possibly will sum up some of the most important parts of this discussion.

The investigation that I have tried to work out with about a hundred students in a detailed way has shown certain clear defects that suggest certain remedies. In the first place, it is evident that intelligence alone is not a satisfactory indication of college achievement. There must be in addition to intelligence, character, the right sort of temperament, the right sort of ideals. At times, too, students are not sized up properly by intelligence tests. Tests should be framed that do not penalize the slow but accurate thinkers. No student should be judged inferior in mental ability until it is definitely ascertained that he is not handicapped in his psychological examinations by linguistic difficulties. It is not fair to exclude a student from college on the basis of low psychological scores alone. In some instances interesting facts have been discovered in regard to college students that have obtained high psychological scores and also high academic records. Not infrequently a brilliant man is putting little time in his college work. Everything comes easy to him and he considers that his work is a task to be accom-

plished rather than an opportunity for self-improvement. He does no more than the law demands and is content to waste a large amount of his time. Unless our colleges as well as our lower schools find some means of giving these best students a worth-while job to perform they are failing at a critical point in the training of the youth of the land, namely in the development of the leader to his highest intellectual and moral capacity.

It may be said that the use of psychological tests at Brown in connection with the examination of students' records, with personal interviews and other data, have clearly emphasized some of the most important reasons why a man succeeds or fails in college. These reasons are: First, his innate intelligence and leading capacity; character, particularly his earnestness and will-to-do; his temperament, particularly his emotional stability; his ideals, plans and purposes; his previous training, particularly habits of scholarship and study; his outside interests and demands. If any of these elements is at fault in a conspicuous degree, success at college is practically impossible. If all were present in their proper proportion and relationship, no student would experience difficulties in securing a college degree in any institution of higher learning in America.

Dr. Harker (Illinois Women's College): I wonder if these tests that have been spoken of have been attempted at the beginning of the summer vacation instead of waiting until the actual entrance college and when the student has no recourse. I wonder if any attempt ever has been made to hold them, say, in June so as to determine who are ready for entrance and who are not.

Mr. Colvin: That is a matter that we have discussed a good deal at Brown, and we realize the desirability of it. The great difficulty is in giving these tests to an entering class widely scattered all over the country. You cannot give them the way you give the ordinary entrance examinations. They have to be given under personal direction and with a good deal of care. Not anybody can administer these tests. It would be desirable to give these examinations early but it has not been done. The only thing that has been done is that certain of these tests have been given to high school seniors at the end of their high school course. If under adequate supervision and with

adequate persons to administer them, it would seem to me to be extremely valuable data for colleges to take into consideration.

CHURCH WORK AMONG WOMEN STUDENTS

AGNES M. HALL

Department of Religious Education of the Protestant Episcopal Church

May I say first that I conceive the church as a family group in almost every department of its work? Therefore, I hesitated to say that I would speak about the church's work among women students as separate from men students, because it does not seem as though in most of our thought in regard to students we should separate them. Yet, just as the church represents the whole family of people, so we have to remember that most families are not very successful merely when they have a father. There are many places in every family life where woman, the mother of the family, must come in to give counsel and advice. Just as we would not think of a student of college age being well advised without the counsel of her mother, so I do not believe that we as representatives of the church are ever going to meet adequately the needs of the daughters of the church until we have women workers, and until we begin to think of the special problems which are theirs.

Thus far the churches have thought particularly of the work in the state institutions; that is most of the discussion thus far, speaking from the point of view of the Council of Church Boards of Education, has been directed either toward the church college or toward the work of co-educational universities and colleges. There our primary concern has been that of the pastoral care of the students. In most of our state universities we have university pastors. In many of our churches we have also church clubs or guilds of one sort or another. We have certain religious education activities. We do more or less for the vocational guidance of our students. To just a few things about the work of the church in co-educational institutions I would like to call your attention.

All of you know the way in which most of our campuses

are organized. With undergraduate activities of our campus life separated into those for men and those for women. This is true of student government and the athletic associations. Of course there is the successful work that the Y. W. C. A.'s and the Y. M. C. A.'s are doing separately.

When we turn to the work that the churches are doing, we find with very few exceptions that there is a man alone to do the work with the men and the women students. Some years ago I was a secretary in one of the universities here represented, and I recall very vividly having to sit in numerous meetings with some of you here in this room, and having to say, "But, gentlemen, remember that there are women as well as men in this university," and I think that the reason we as a group so often forgot that there were women in the university was not because they were few in number but because there were so few women workers.

Dean Clark has called to our attention tonight the great value of personal touch, and I have only this one question to bring to you gentlemen. Do you feel that you are equipped to give adequate personal attention to the women students in the universities and colleges under your supervision? Can you give that which in the home we conceive to be the work of the woman? If you cannot, then we as churches must turn our minds and our thoughts in the direction of some possible way of having women secretaries for women students as we have ministers for men students, not to separate them entirely, but to give to the woman who might be called into the university work that opportunity for the personal touch among the women students which she is best equipped to give.

In addition to this, are we adequately, because of our lack of contact and personal touch with the women students, planning for the needs of women students' religious education in our Bible study and in our class work? If we tested out the courses which are now being given in our university centers would we find that they are meeting the needs of the women students; I mean the classes given within our churches. It is a question which we may well consider.

The other question is in regard to vocational guidance. Just as the young man turns to the older man for counsel and

advice, so I believe that the young woman turns much more naturally to the older woman for counsel and advice vocationally.

Passing from that particular phase of the church's work, may I suggest one other place where we must more seriously consider the women members of our churches; that is in the great women's colleges where men do not have the easy access and the very close contact a woman could have because of the very nature of the case. I recall two visits this year that I have made where we have had very adequate local ministers, but they said to me, that because they could not go up on a women's college campus and make calls on the girls, the result was that the only ones whom they reached were the more pious ones who always went to church on Sunday. We must consider some plan of having more adequate supervision by women in the women's colleges.

Then, if we turn to the third great group of institutions where women largely predominate, *i. e.* the normal and teachers' colleges of the country, we find it is certainly true that the church, if it wishes teachers to have a Christian point of view, and wishes to train teachers for the Sunday schools, must face the problems of the normal and teachers' colleges. I do not know the solution, but merely call your attention to the fact and beseech you as church board secretaries and workers, to consider your responsibility toward the normal school students—that largest group of women students in the country. The church has thus far not evidenced enough interest to even know the number of church students in the normal schools in this country. We have not even known the number in our respective churches. We do not know the possibilities for taking such a thing as courses of religious education into the normal schools. We have not considered schools of religion in connection with normal schools.

The fourth great group which the church must begin to consider is that of the great metropolitan student centers, and I speak particularly in connection with the women students of the medical schools and the nurses. As churches we surely have a responsibility toward those students, which seems to me just as clear as the responsibility toward the students in the

college and universities. We are always talking about the need for nurses and medical students in our foreign work, and yet I wonder whether any one of us could enter any large metropolitan center today and walk into a nurses' training school and have any single nurse say to us that she had even been approached by her particular local church to know how it could minister unto her. You are familiar with the excuses of the local people: "You know the nurses are very busy, they have peculiar schedules, their hours are different." Yet when you realize that in the city of Boston alone, according to the estimate of last year, there were 30,000 metropolitan students, I do not believe that you can easily say that we have no responsibility for them.

There is just one other thing which I should like to mention in regard to women students, and I say it with some hesitancy after sitting through these two days of meetings. I wonder if all of us church workers believe, as we seem to assume in our discussions, that students are interested in the church today, that it holds a vital part in their lives. I must confess that having visited a good many schools this fall, I find that we are often incidental to the life and thinking and interest of college students today. We say students are different from the students of the last generation, that their terminology is different; we say a great many other things about them, but what are we doing about it? Are we going on making beautiful plans in terminology which students do not understand or do not care to understand and are not interested in? Are we making plans for educational programs, church Bible classes, and so on, that are not connected up with the real under-graduate thinking? How many of us really have listened enough to under-graduate thinking to know what they do want.

In connection with that may I just suggest that in your touch with women students it is perfectly proper to assume that girls are interested in getting married, that most of them are thinking about it almost more than anything else? Do we take into consideration the fact that girls are going to be mothers, that they are going to train little children, that most of them are planning to do it for the rest of their lives? We are not giving them courses that will help them to be mothers, to train

little children, to make the home what it should be. Another group consists of those who are for a few years at least going to be teachers. How much are we as churches helping them to be good teachers? The third group will be the volunteer workers in our many women's organizations within our churches. How much are we connecting up the undergraduate women students with the what I may call "graduate women's organizations" of our various churches? A fourth, but very small group of our women will be employed workers within our churches. By that I mean the missionary workers, both home and foreign. It seems as though in almost all our appeals to the women students we appeal to them only to be home and foreign mission board workers. We appeal to them only from the straight vocational end, when we have an opportunity, if we would interpret it rightfully, to give to them as undergraduates a conception of the home, a conception of the vocation of teaching, and a conception of their place as volunteer workers in the church, which will make of them the leaders we want.